



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,654	04/30/2001	Todd P. Lukanc	39153/371 (F0812)	2723

7590

02/28/2003

Paul S. Hunter
FOLEY & LARDNER
Firstar Center
777 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202-5367

EXAMINER

MALDONADO, JULIO J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2823

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,654

Applicant(s)

LUKANC ET AL.

Examiner

Julio J. Maldonado

Art Unit

2823

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. The non-final rejection as set forth in paper No.5 is withdrawn in response to applicants' amendments.
2. A new 103(a) rejection is made as set forth in this Office Action.
3. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants' cite, "...etching the anti-reflective coating to form a pattern; trim etching the reflective metal material layer according to the pattern...".

However, according to Figs.2-3, the pattern of the antireflective layer is wider than the reflective metal layer after the trim etch step. If the applicant intends to recite using the patter as a mask in the "trim etching" step it must be clearly recited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2823

7. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. (U.S. 6,156,485) in view of Maa (U.S. 4,460,435).

In reference to claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 11-15, 17 and 19, Tang et al. (Figs.4A-4D) in a related method of high aspect ratio etching teach the steps of depositing a reflective metal layer (230) over a gate material layer (220), wherein said reflective metal layer (230) comprises tungsten; depositing a mask layer (150, 230) over the reflective metal layer (230), wherein said mask layer (150, 230) comprises a layer of anti-reflective coating (ARC) (230) and a layer of resist (150); removing portions of the anti-reflective coating (230) to form a pattern; etching the reflective metal layer (230) using the pattern formed from the removed portions of the anti-reflective coating (230); and removing portions of the gate material layer (220) using the pattern from the removed portions of the anti-reflective coating (230), wherein said ARC layer (230) comprises silicon oxynitride (SiON) (column 7, line 16 – column 8, line 3).

Tang et al. fail to teach depositing a polysilicon layer; and trim etching the tungsten layer. However, Maa (Figs.1-4) in a related patterning process teaches depositing a polysilicon layer (16) over an oxide layer (14) overlying a substrate (10); depositing a metal layer (18) over the polysilicon layer (16), wherein said metal comprises tungsten; depositing a photoresist layer (20) over the metal layer (18); patterning the photoresist layer (20); and trim etching the metal layer (18), wherein the etching step comprises isotropic etching (column 3, lines 11 – 59). It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2823

combine the teachings of Maa and Tang et al. to enable the etching step of Maa to be performed in Tang et al. and furthermore to enable the formation of narrow lines in an integrated circuit (column 1, lines 19 – 32). Regarding polysilicon, the examiner takes official notice that polysilicon as a gate material was known at the time the invention was made. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maa and Tang et al. to enable a polysilicon gate structure of Maa to be formed.

In reference to claims 5, 10, 12, 16 and 20, the combined teachings of Tang et al. and Maa teach that the reflective material layer is optically opaque to the gate material layer with a thickness of about 500 to 3,000 angstroms (Tang et al., column 7, lines 16-34). The combination of Tang et al. and Maa fail to teach depositing said reflective material layer with a thickness of about 80-200 angstroms. However, This claim is prima facie obvious without showing that the claimed ranges achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art range. In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also In re Huang, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (claimed ranges of a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art) and In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious).

Art Unit: 2823

8. Claims 3, 6, 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ('485) in view of Maa ('435) as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-17, 19 and 20 above, and further in view of McKee (U.S. 5,804,088).

The combined teachings of Tang et al. and Maa substantially teach all aspects of the invention but fail to teach the steps of providing a gate structure comprising polysilicon and trim etching the anti-reflective coating to form a pattern, wherein said trim etching comprises isotropic etching. However, McKee (Figs.8a-83) in a related method to form gate structures teaches the steps of providing a gate material layer (806) comprising polysilicon; depositing an anti-reflective coating (821); and trim etching the anti-reflective coating (821) to form a pattern, wherein said trim etching comprises isotropic etching (column 5, line 23 – column 6, line 15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to form a polysilicon gate material layer as taught by McKee in the high aspect ratio etching process of Tang et al. and Maa, since polysilicon gate structures are well-known its manufacture involves common knowledge in the art. Also it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to trim etch the anti-reflective coating as taught by McKee in the high aspect ratio etching process of Tang et al., since this would reduce the line width of the gate structure (column 1, lines 59-63).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. Papers related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2823 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit 2823 via the Art Unit 2823 Fax Center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 3C23. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989). The Art Unit 2823 Fax Center number is **(703) 305-3432**. The Art Unit 2823 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Art Unit 2823 applications.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Julio J. Maldonado** at **(703) 306-0098** and between the hours of 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday or by e-

Art Unit: 2823

mail via julio.maldonado@uspto.gov. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri, can be reached on (703) 306-2794.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Group 2800 Receptionist** at (703) 308-0956.

JMR
2/21/03


George Fourson
Primary Examiner
2823